APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,069	04/12/2001	Bjorn J. Gruenwald	INME-002/00US	1466

29315   7590   06/11/2003

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
CORRIELUS, JEAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/833,069	GRUENWALD, BJORN J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jean M Corrielus	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 April 2003_ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20 and 28-38_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☒ Claim(s) _28-38_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _12, 13 & 15_	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the application filed on 23 April 2003, which claims 21-27 are canceled and claims 1-20 and 28-38 are presented for further examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 and 28-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated submission of an information disclosure statement.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement filed 31 October 2002 (paper no.12), 25 November 2002 (paper no.13) and 23 April 2003 (paper no.15) complies with the provisions of M.E.P.. § 609. It has been placed in the application file, the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al.

(hereinafter "Miller") U S Patent No. 5,926,811 in view of Rennison et al (hereinafter

"Rennison") US Patent no. 6,154,213.

As to claim 1, Miller discloses the claimed features "organizing the data, based on relationship

among the data, into a network including at least one predecessor group and a plurality of

descendant groups" (col.8, lines 32-67; col.5, lines 40-col.6, line 42); "an occurrence of data

located in the search term in one of said plurality of descendant groups" (col.4, lines 37-40; col.5,

lines 5-45; col.6, lines 58-67); and "traversing said network from said occurrence in said one of

said plurality of descendant groups to related data in said at least one predecessor group using

said relationships among the data" (col.4, lines 12-50).

However, Miller does not explicitly discloses the use of "building a context including said

occurrence and said related data thereby retrieving data from the database corresponding to the

search term".

On the other hand, Rennison discloses the claimed "traversing said network from said occurrence

in said one of said plurality of descendant groups to related data in said at least one predecessor

group using said relationships among the data" (col.2, line 62-col.3, line 18); and "building a

context including said occurrence and said related data thereby retrieving data from the database

corresponding to the search term"as a means for dynamically constructing representation of the

context resulting from each query (col.3, lines 20-25; col.4, lines 1-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the

time the present invention was made to modify the Miller's system, wherein the relationship of the

collection, provided thereof (see of Miller's fig.15) would incorporate the use of using a context

including said occurrence and said related data thereby retrieving data from the database

corresponding to the search term, as suggested by Rennison (col.3, lines 20-25; col.4, lines 1-12).

One of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made

would have been motivated to do such a modification because that would provide users with the

ability to dynamically control the density and granularity within a topic of interest, thereby giving

the user a global understanding of where she/he is in the information structure and what her/his

current location in the information structure.

As to claims 2-6, Rennison discloses the claimed "wherein said organizing the data into a network

comprises organizing the data into a hierarchy" (col.9, lines 54-62); "wherein said organizing the

data into a hierarchy comprises organizing the data into a hierarchy having a plurality of levels

including a first level associated with said at least one predecessor group and a second level

associated with at least a portion of said plurality of descendant groups, said first level being

higher than said second level in said hierarchy" (col.10, lines 16-55); "wherein said traversing said

network comprises upwardly traversing said hierarchy from said occurrence in said one of said

plurality of descendants groups to related data in said at least one predecessor group using said

relationships among the data" (col.9, lines 56-67; col.12, lines 8-35; col.18, lines 4-45); "building

a context including said occurrence and said related data and said second related data thereby

retrieving data from the database corresponding to the search term" (col.3, lines 20-25; col.4,

lines 1-12; col.12, lines 8-35); and

 "wherein said traversing said network comprises downwardly traversing said hierarchy from said

occurrence in said one of said plurality of descendants groups to related data in said at least one

predecessor group using said relationships among the data"(col.9, lines 56-67; col.12, lines 8-35;

col.18, lines 4-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the

time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references. One of

ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made would have

been motivated to do such a combination because that would provide users with the ability to

dynamically control the density and granularity within a topic of interest, thereby giving the user a

global understanding of where she/he is in the information structure and what her/his current

location in the information structure.

As to claims 7-11, Rennison discloses the claimed "comprising downwardly and exhaustively

traversing said at least one predecessor group to a plurality of second related data in said plurality

of descendant groups using said relationships among the data"(col.9, lines 56-67; col.12, lines 8-

35; col.18, lines 4-45); "building a context including comprises said occurrence and said related

data and said plurality second related data thereby retrieving data from the database

corresponding to the search term"(col.3, lines 20-25; col.4, lines 1-12; col.12, lines 8-35);

"exhaustively traversing said network from said related data in said at least one predecessor group

to a plurality of second related data in said plurality of descendant groups using said relationships

among the data"(col.9, lines 56-67; col.12, lines 8-35; col.18, lines 4-45); building a context

including comprises said occurrence and said related data and said plurality second related data

thereby retrieving data from the database corresponding to the search term"(col.3, lines 20-25;

col.4, lines 1-12; col.12, lines 8-35); and "storing said context as a subset of the database" (col.4,

lines 1-12, col.9, line 63-col.10, line 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the

time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references. One of

ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made would have

been motivated to do such a combination because that would provide users with the ability to

dynamically control the density and granularity within a topic of interest, thereby giving the user a

global understanding of where she/he is in the information structure and what her/his current

location in the information structure.

As to claims 12-16, Rennison discloses the claimed "wherein said organizing the data, based on

relationships among the data into a network comprises forming a relational table indicative of

relationships between instances of a first one of said plurality of descendant groups" (col.8, line

63-col.9, line 62); "wherein said forming a relational table comprises forming a many-to many

transfer file indicative of relationships between said instance of said at least one predecessor group

and said instances of said first one of said plurality of descendant groups" (col.4, lines 12-33,

col.10, lines 16-col.11, line 33); "wherein said forming a relational table comprises forming a

many-to many forward transfer file indicative of relationships between said instance of said at

least one predecessor group and said instances of said first one of said plurality of descendant

groups"(col.4, lines 12-33, col.10, lines 16-col.11, line 33); "wherein said forming a relational

table comprises forming a many-to many reverse transfer file indicative of relationships between

said instance of said at least one predecessor group and said instances of said first one of said

plurality of descendant groups to said instances of said at least one predecessor group"(col.4,

lines 12-33, col.10, lines 16-col.11, line 33) and "wherein said organizing the data, based on

relationships among the data into a network comprises forming a relational table indicative of

relationships between instances of a first one of said plurality of descendant groups and a second

one of said plurality of descendant groups "(col.9, lines 56-67; col.12, lines 8-35; col.18, lines 4-

45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing,

at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references. One

of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made would

have been motivated to do such a combination because that would provide users with the ability

to dynamically control the density and granularity within a topic of interest, thereby giving the

user a global understanding of where she/he is in the information structure and what her/his current location in the information structure.

As to claims 17-20, Rennison discloses the claimed "wherein said forming a relational table comprises forming a many-to many transfer file indicative of relationships between said instance of said first one of said plurality of descendant groups and said instances of said second one of said plurality of descendant groups"(col.4, lines 12-33, col.9, lines 23-62; col.10, lines 16-col.11, line 33); "wherein said forming a relational table comprises forming a many-to many forward transfer file indicative of relationships between said instance of said first one of said plurality of descendant groups and said instances of said second one of said plurality of descendant groups" (col.8, lines 42-67; col.13, lines 8-42); "wherein said forming a relational table comprises forming a many-to-many reverse transfer file indicative of relationships between said instance of said first one of said plurality of descendant groups and said instances of said second one of said plurality of descendant groups"(col.8, lines 42-67; col.13, lines 8-42); and "converting the data to a numeric format in an appropriate number system" (col.34, lines 55-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references. One of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made would have been motivated to do such a combination because that would provide users with the ability to dynamically control the density and granularity within a topic of interest, thereby giving the user a

global understanding of where she/he is in the information structure and what her/his current

location in the information structure.

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 28-38 are allowable in light of the applicant's arguments and in light of the prior

art made of record (see PTO 1449 and 892).

Reason for Indicating Allowable Subject Matter

7.   The present application has been thoroughly reviewed. Upon extensive and exhaustive

searches of various databases (see search notes in case jacket), the examiner respectfully submits

that the claimed feature "traversing the hierarchy from said second occurrence to an instance of a

second one of the plurality of the parents using at least one of the direct relationships or the

indirect relationships; traversing the hierarchy from said instance of said second one of the first

plurality of descendants to an instance of an instance of a second one of the at least some of the

second plurality of descendants using the second direct relationships; building a first context

corresponding to said occurrence, said instance of one of the plurality of the parents, said instance

of one of the first plurality of descendants, and said instance of one of the at least some of the

second plurality of descendants; and building a second context corresponding to said second

occurrence, said instance of said second one of the plurality of the parents, said instance of said

second one of the first plurality of descendants, and said instance of said second one of the at least

some of the second plurality of descendants" in the method for retrieving information from a

database organized in a hierarchy having a parent, a first plurality of descendants each having a

direct relationship to the parent, and a second plurality of descendants each having an indirect

relationship to the parent through at least one of the first plurality of descendants, at plurality of

descendants of claims 28 and 37 respectively, and in conjunction with all other limitations of the

dependent and independent claims would not found anticipated or obvious over the prior art made

of record. Therefore, all pending 28-38 are hereby allowed.

Since allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant is encouraged to submit

formal drawings in response to this Office Action. The early submission of formal drawings will

permit the Office to review the drawings for acceptability and to resolve any informalities

remaining therein before the application is passed to issue. This will avoid possible delays in the

issue process.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the

payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for

Allowance".

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 31 October 2002 (paper no.12), 25 November 2002 (paper no.13) and 23 April 2003 (paper no.15) prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MEP. § 609(B)(2)(I). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or early communication from the Examiner should directed to **Jean M. Corrielus** whose telephone number is (703) 306-3035. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. at (703)305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner   of   Patents   and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231 **or faxed to:** (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications

intended for entry) **Or:** (703)305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT") Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021

Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed

to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Jean M. Corrielus

Patent Examiner

June 5, 2003